[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [6th February 1924

have a catalogue of the several deviations from the old Bill which are of importance and which have been desired by that Committee. That Committee sat in April and May, and, taking the old Bill as the basis of the discussion, it practically went over all the sections suggesting amendments. With those amendments before it, there was a further disscussion which from time to time was postponed owing to the exigencies of election engagements of the various Members, with the result that it met only in November last. So, the Bill that is now presented to us, though failing to satisfy the desires of the several interests in some matters, has to a great extent gone to satisfy those desires. In these circumstances, on the ground that it has not been published in the vernacular languages, applying for adjournment for one month only will not secure to that Bill or to those interested in the Bill or in such a measure any great advantage. For, nobody who has suggested this adjournment has also suggested that the Government should within this interval reshape or alter the Bill so as to meet any criticism that might be urged between now and the next month. The object not being that, there is no harm done in considering the question whether leave should be given at this meeting. No useful purpose will be served by putting it off for one month or six months. As for six months' adjournment, as has been pointed out by the hon. Member in charge of the Bill, it might be for the consideration of the rejection of the Bill, and as for one month's adjournment there will be no useful purpose served at all. I find that he has given an assurance that he would not hurry up the stages of this Bill. Sufficient time will be given for publication in all the vernacular languages and for receiving representations from all persons interested inside this House and outside this House. It may be necessary to receive representations from lawyers. I think it would do well not to seek this adjournment.

" Moreover, there is one feature in the history of this Bill. A Select Committee, so to say, has sat over this Bill, which had a hand in shaping this Bill, though not every portion that was wanted to be altered has been properly dealt with. There will be another Select Committee consisting of Members of this House which contains a number of new Members. I expect a number of new Members who happen to have come into this Council to be included in the Select Committee whose advice it will be an advantage and a privilege to have in the shaping of this Bill in the Select Committee. I have no doubt that others outside the Council will give their evidence or suggestions as witnesses before the Select Committee. For these reasons, I do oppose the application for adjournment."

Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi :—" I move for a closure."

The hon. the President :—" I am not for putting the motion for closure just yet for this reason. There are two motions for adjournment before the House and I expect that Members opposed to the Bill will be ranged on the side of either of these motions. They are as it were a little stick and a big stick with which to beat the Bill. If hon. Members desire that the discussion should be continued after these motions have been disposed of, I have no objection, but ordinarily, I should say, the discussion of these adjournment motions should leave little room for prolonged discussion of the main motion in case they both fail."

The hon. Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar :—" As a matter of fact, if I may venture to say, I shall be obliged to the various Members who have been

6th February 1924]

Serial number.	Name of district.	Name of project.	Estimated cost (with year).	Area proposed to be irrigated.
		B.—Larger irrigation projects that cannot be properly worked out without an Irrigation Law.		
			RS.	ACS.
1	Tanjore ..	Cauvery (Metur) Reservoir Project.	562 lakhs—(1922) ..	280,000.
2	Kistna and Guntur.	Kistna Reservoir ..	834 lakhs—(1912) ..	735,000 first crop and 167,000 second crop.
3	Ceded Districts and Nellore district.	Tungabhadra Reservoir.	13 crores—(1909) ..	961,800 of wet crop. Will also protect 1,000,000 acres of dry crop.
		C.—Projects worked out on a productive basis which had to be held in abeyance on account of water-rates agreed to being higher than current ones. Without an Irrigation Law a binding agreement cannot be made with ryots.		
1	Gōdāvari ..	Polavaram Island Extension	18·55 lakhs—(1922).	16,316.
2	Do. ..	Coringa Island Extension.	4·69 lakhs—(1919)..	14,374.
3	Guntūr ..	Pratur Pumping Extension.	17·57 lakhs—(1923)..	10,500 (single crop).
4	Kurnool ..	Velgode Reservoir and Kurnool-Cuddapah Canal Improvements.	102 lakhs—(1917) ..	46,100 of first crop and 15,000 of second crop.
5	Bellary ..	Benikal Tank Project.	1 lakh—(1915) ..	400.
6	Anantapur.	Upper Penner Project.	23·84 lakhs—(1917).	12,000.
7	Salem ..	Marandahalli Anicut Extension.	2·86 lakhs—(1917) ..	1,600 for first crop and 500 for second crop.
8	Malabar ..	Meengarai Reservoir ..	13 lakhs	24,000.
9	Do. ..	Malampuzha Reservoir.	26·5 lakhs	40,000.
10	Do. ..	Kilakancheri Project ..	14·5 lakhs	5,000.
11	Nellore ..	Vengalapuram Project.	34 lakhs—(1916) ..	16,500.
12	Do. ..	Atleru Reservoir ..	7·56 lakhs—(1917) ..	3,000 (first crop) and 1,060 (second crop).
13	Do. ..	Gandipalem Reservoir.	16·40 lakhs—(1917).	13,543.
14	Do. ..	Rallapad Reservoir ..	30 lakhs	13,235.
15	Chingleput.	Uttiramerur Project ..	12·82 lakhs—(1917).	2,352.
16	Do.	Madurantakam Tank Improvements.	4·80 lakhs—(1906) ..	574 acres of first crop new irrigation. Will also protect existing irrigation of 13,283 acres and provide water for the cultivation of 600 acres (second crop).
17	Trichinopoly	Pimbalur Reservoir ..	1·48 lakhs—(1922) ..	500.
18	Do.	Arasalur Project ..	56,000—(1922) ..	225.
19	Do.	Omandur Project ..	60,000—(1922) ..	300.
20	South Arcot.	Reclamation of the Kaliveli swamp.	14 lakhs (1922) ..	4,865.

General note.—The necessity for an Irrigation Law was pointed out by the Government of India on more occasions than one. In 1905 they expressed it as their decisive opinion that 'Legislation is necessary in Madras in order to secure to Government such power of control over the water stored for irrigation as will enable it to make the best possible distribution thereof and prevent embarrassing litigation' and that they would therefore be 'reluctant to authorize the commencement of construction of the Cauvery Reservoir project until the Irrigation Law has been placed in a satisfactory state'. This opinion was reiterated by them in 1906 in connexion with the Tungabhadra project. The opinion must, of course, be taken to be applicable to the Kistna Reservoir and other more important projects in the Presidency.